1		
2		
3		
4		
5	LIMITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT
6	WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA	
7		
8	RICHARD ARLEY FISHER,	CASE NO. C24-5484 BHS
9	Petitioner, v.	ORDER
10	JEFFERY PERKINS,	
11	Respondent.	
12		
13	THIS MATTER is before the court on pro se petitioner Fisher's post-judgment	
14	objections to the Magistrate Judge's R&R, Dkt. 23. It appears that Fisher's objections	
15	may have been received by the Clerk's office before the Court's Order adopting the R&R	
16	was entered.	
17	The R&R concluded that Fisher's claims were time barred. Dkt. 20 at 3 (citing 28	
18	U.S.C. § 2244(d)). The Court agreed. Dkt. 21. Fisher contends that the statute he was	
19	convicted of violating is "unconstitutional," and seems to suggest that he did not discover	
20	that "fact" until after his one-year limitations period had run. Dkt. 23 at 2.	
21		
22		

These arguments are not persuasive, and they do not demonstrate that the R&R was clearly erroneous or contrary to law. Fisher's objections are OVER-RULED. The case remains closed. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated this 23rd day of January, 2025. United States District Judge